

In re Appln. of Houis et al.
Application No. 09/645,777

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 11, 12, and 20-25 are pending in this application, claims 13-17 having been previously withdrawn from consideration. The Office Action mailed September 30, 2004 indicated that claims 11, 12, and 20-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form if correction is made relative to the objection to claim 20.

In the Response to Final Office Action mailed January 11, 2005, claims 11, 12, 20-22, and 24 were rewritten in independent form, claims 9-10 and 18-19 having been cancelled therein. The response indicated that claims 13-17 would be cancelled upon allowance of the remaining claims. Inasmuch as claims 23 and 25 depended from now independent claims 11 and 20, respectively, claims 23 and 25 were not been rewritten in independent form in the Response mailed January 11, 2005. The claims and title were rewritten to change the spelling of "moulded" and "moulding" to "molded" and "molding," respectively.

The Examiner declined to enter the Response to Final Office Action and issued an Advisory Action mailed January 31, 2005. The Advisory Action raised certain objections to claims 11, 20, 23 and 25 as proposed to be amended in the Response to Office Action mailed January 11, 2005. Further, the Advisory Action disapproved of the proposed drawing correction as not including reference numbers and corresponding numbers in the text of the specification detailed description. Inasmuch as the Advisory Action did not enter the Response mailed January 11, 2005, a portion of the proposed amendments presented in the prior Response are repeated and supplemented herein. More specifically, claims 11, 12, 21, 22, and 24 have been amended to independent form. Claims 10 and 18-20 have been cancelled. Claims 9 and 25 have been amended to alternate dependencies in view of the cancellation of certain claims. Unelected claims 13-17 have been cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

Drawing Objection

The Office Action additionally objected to the drawings as failing to show a second bellows. Accordingly, attached Figure 4, which shows first and second bellows, had been submitted for addition in the Response to Final Office Action, and corresponding commentary had been added in the specification at page 2. In response to the Advisory Action, numerals have additionally been added to Figure 4 and corresponding numerals added in the specification at pages 3-4.

In re Appln. of Houis et al.
Application No. 09/645,777

Observations of the Advisory Action

The Advisory Action asserts that proposed claim 11 did not include limitations of intervening claim 10. As indicated in the conversation between the undersigned and the Examiner earlier today, lines 6-7 of the claim 11 as proposed in the previous Response included the limitation "the connector element being of a hollow tubular form," as was claimed in cancelled claim 10. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn. Claim 11 has also been amended to claim that the axis of the "parison," rather than the "bellows," as suggested in the Advisory Action. The applicants respectfully note, however, that the Examiner's observation in the Advisory Action regarding the use of the term "bellows" in original claim 11 was not set forth in the Office Action made final, but, rather, was presented for the first time in the Advisory Action.

The Advisory Action further stated that proposed claim 20 did not include the limitations of intervening claims 9 and 19. Again, as indicated in the conversation between the undersigned and the Examiner earlier today, lines 6-7 of the claim 20 as proposed in the previous Response included the limitation "the connector element being of a hollow tubular form," as was claimed in cancelled claim 19. It is conceded, however, that the limitation of claim 9, "the connector element [being] made of moulded thermoplastic material," was inadvertently excluded from claim 20.

The Advisory Action further stated that proposed claims 11 and 20, and proposed claims 23 and 25 could be subject to double patenting rejections. While it is submitted that claims 11 and 20 as proposed to be amended in the previously filed Response to Office Action were not identical, in view of the Examiner's observations, the applicant has amended claim 11 to indicate that the parison (as opposed to the bellows) includes the axis, and has cancelled claim 20. Claim 9 (which included the "thermoplastic limitation") has been restored and amended to depend from claim 11, thereby providing the coverage as previously set forth in now cancelled claim 20. Claim 25 has been amended to depend from claim 9 in view of the cancellation of claim 20.

In re Appln. of Houis et al.
Application No. 09/645,777

Conclusion

In view of the amendments set forth herein, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited and requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela J. Ruschay Reg. No. 34,242
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: March 2, 2005